



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,930	03/08/2005	Udo Rotermund	266139US0PCT	7506
22850	7590	05/16/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER SMITH, JENNIFER A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/16/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/526,930	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ROTERMUND ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JENNIFER A. SMITH	<b>Art Unit</b> 1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/08/2005</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Application Status***

Claims 1-30 are pending and presented for examination.

### ***Priority***

Applicant's claim for foreign priority is acknowledged. Priority papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/08/2005 was filed and is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9, 10, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1793

Claim 9 and 10 recites the limitation "the further compounds" in line two of the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because it is not clear what the claimed temperature range is.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1793

Claims 1, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 18, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biesmans et al. (Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids 225 (1998) 64-68) in view of Wilmsen (US Patent No. 4,043,950).

In regard to claims 1, 4, and 13-15, Biesmans teaches synthesis of carbon aerogels (foam) by pyrolysis of (nitrogen containing) polyisocyanate based aerogels [See Section 2. Experimental Procedure]. The aerogels have a high porosity (shown in Figure 4) and open cell content (see Table 1). While the Biesman reference does not inherently disclose the values of porosity and open cell content, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill that a carbon foam, prepared via the same process would have the same instantly claimed physical characteristics. The aerogels of the Biesmans reference are 100% by mass of the polyisocyanate polymer (which is inherently has a nitrogen content of more than 6% by mass). In regard to the weight of carbon, the Biesmans reference teaches a "carbon aerogel" and therefore inherently has a carbon content above 70% by weight.

Biesmans fails to teach the incorporation of an inorganic material into the structure.

Wilmsen teaches a process for producing foams. Calcium carbonate is a possible additive in solid or liquid form [See Claim 9].

Art Unit: 1793

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill, at the time of Applicant's invention, to utilize an inorganic oxide such as calcium carbonate as taught by Wilmsen in the foam preparation method taught by Biesmans because such an additive is used for modifying and improving the structural and physical properties of the foam [See Wilmsen, Column 3, lines 46-48].

In regard to claim 5, Biesmans teaches the use of a polymeric isocyanate Suprasec DNR – a commercially available product. Absorbance ratio is an inherent feature of the isocyanate product and therefore is not patentable over the prior art which discloses the use of an isocyanate. See MPEP 2111.04-II.

In regard to claim 17, Biesmans teaches increasing the temperature at a rate of 0.6°C/min, within the claimed range of claim 17 [Page 62, Column 2, line 2].

In regard to claim 18, Biesmans teaches pyrolysis in an argon atmosphere [See Page 65, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph].

In regard to claim 27, Biesmans teaches the process for making such a foam and the resultant foam having the claimed properties [See entire reference, particularly Figure 4, Table 1, Abstract and Introduction].

Art Unit: 1793

In regard to claims 28 and 29, carbon aerogels disclosed in the Biesmans reference, because of their high temperature insulation properties, can be used as materials in energy storage devices, for example in intercalation anodes for rechargeable lithium batteries and in electrodes for double-layer capacitors [See Biesmans, Page 65, Paragraph 1].

Therefore, claims 1, 4-5, 13-18, and 27-29 would have been obvious in view of the Biesmans and Wilmsen references.

Claims 2, 3, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biesmans et al. (Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids 225 (1998) 64-68) in view of Wilmsen (US Patent No. 4,043,950) and further in view of Pekala et al. (Third International Symposium on Aerogels (1991)).

The Biesmans and Wilmsen references teach all of the limitations of claim 1 but fail to teach the polymer foam to be urea-formaldehyde resin or a melamine-formaldehyde resin.

Pekala teaches the synthesis of organic aerogels. Starting materials include resorcinol with formaldehyde and melamine with formaldehyde. The reference also teaches any multifunctional monomer can be polymerized to form an aerogel [See Page 7, Summary].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill, at the time of Applicant's invention, to utilize a formaldehyde polymer foam such as those disclosed in the Pekala reference because the structure and properties of the desired areogel (like that disclosed in Biesmans and Wilmsen) are dictated by polymerization conditions and formaldehyde resins and their uses have been shown to be known in the art.

Therefore, claims 2, 3, and 12 would have been obvious in view of the Biesmans, Wilmsen, and Pekala references.

Claims 6-8 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biesmans et al. (Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids 225 (1998) 64-68) in view of Wilmsen (US Patent No. 4,043,950) and further in view of Falkenstein et al. (US Patent No. 4,066,580).

The Biesmans and Wilmsen references teach all of the limitations of claim 1 but fail to teach the particular method of preparing polymeric isocyanate adducts.

Falkenstein teaches a process for the manufacture of polyisocyanurate foams [See Claims].



It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill, at the time of Applicant's invention, to utilize a isocyanate production process like that disclosed in the Falkenstein reference because the structure and properties of the desired areogel (like that disclosed in Biesmans and Wilmsen) are not affected by the production process of the starting material and one skilled in the art would be able to utilize any well known production process.

In regard to claim 30, carbon aerogels disclosed in the Biesmans reference, because of the their high temperature insulation properties, can be used as materials in energy storage devices, for example in intercalation anodes for rechargeable lithium batteries and in electrodes for double-layer capacitors [See Biesmans, Page 65, Paragraph 1].

Therefore claims 6-8 and 30 would have been obvious in view of the Biesmans, Wilmsen, and Falkenstein references.

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biesmans et al. (Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids 225 (1998) 64-68) in view of Wilmsen (US Patent No. 4,043,950) and further in view of Gregg et al. (US Patent No. 5,840,443).

Art Unit: 1793

The Biesmans and Wilmsen references teach all of the limitations of claim 1 but fail to teach a crown ether structure catalyst.

Gregg et al. teaches a high surface area electrode that is a carbon foam [See Claim 9]. The electrode comprises a redox polymer material such as a crown ether [See Claim 1].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill, at the time of Applicant's invention, to add a crown ether to the carbon nanotube structure of the Biesmans and Wilmsen references because the Gregg reference teaches an electrode cell, a common use of such a carbon foam [See Biesmans, Page 65, Paragraph 1].

Therefore claim 12 would have been obvious in view of the Biesmans, Wilmsen and Gregg references.

Claims 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biesmans et al. (Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids 225 (1998) 64-68) in view of Wilmsen (US Patent No. 4,043,950) and further in view of Stankiewicz et al. (WO 98/02382)

Art Unit: 1793

In regard to claims 19-25, the Biesmans and Wilmsen references teach all of the limitations of claim 1 but fail to teach a two step pyrolysis.

Biesmans teaches pyrolysis takes place between 0°C and 900°C. The reference does not disclose heating up to 1200°C or 1500°C but generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See MPEP 2144.05-II.

Stankiewicz teaches a method for forming a carbon foam. A resin is "cured" in an inert atmosphere such as nitrogen or argon, or in a non-oxidizing atmosphere such as hydrogen. After curing the piece is carbonized to vitreous carbon in an atmosphere at a suitable temperature between 900°C and 3000°C. Here under atmospheric conditions, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, and water vapor are present [See Page 6]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill, at the time of Applicant's invention, to utilize a two-step pyrolyzation process like that taught in Stankiewicz to form the foam disclosed in the Biesmans and Wilmsen references because the heat up rate controls the amount of exothermic heat released into

Art Unit: 1793

the work piece. The shape of the cells in the foam is modified because the heat from the exothermic reaction softens the structure. The second phase of the two step process – in atmosphere – would allow greater control over the reaction, in this sense.

In regard to claim 26, flow rate of the gas streams is not explicitly disclosed in the prior art teachings but is an example of a result-effective variable and can be scaled up or down depending on the desired foam output.

Therefore, claims 19-26 would have been obvious over the Biesmans, Wilmsen, and Stankiewicz references.

### ***Conclusion***

Claims 1-30 are rejected.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER A. SMITH whose telephone number is (571)270-3599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571)272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Roy King/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 1793

Jennifer A. Smith  
May 9, 2008  
TC 1793

JS